1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
9	AT TAC	OMA	
10			
11	ELIZABETH A CARTER,	CASE NO. C12-5628 RJB	
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND	
13	v.	AFFIRMING DECISION OF THE	
14	CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Commissioner of Social Security,	COMMISSIONER	
15	Defendant.		
16	This matter comes before the court on the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate		
17	Judge. Dkt. 17. The court has considered the relevant documents and the remainder of the file		
18	herein.		
19		e Karen L. Strombom issued a Report and	
20	On August 16, 2013, U.S. Magistrate Judge Karen L. Strombom issued a Report and Recommendation, concluding that (1) the ALJ did not err in evaluating the medical evidence in		
21			
22			
23			
24	Plaintiff's residual functional capacity; and (5) the	ALJ and not err in regard to the hypothetical	

question at Step 5 of the sequential evaluation process. Dkt. 17. The Magistrate Judge recommended that the court affirm the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security to deny supplemental security income benefits.

On, 2013, Plaintiff filed objections to the Report and Recommendation, advancing essentially the same arguments that she made in her opening and reply briefs (Dkts. 14 and 16). Dkt. 18. In her response, Defendant addresses Plaintiff's arguments. Dkt. 19.

The court has reviewed the record *de novo* and concludes that the Magistrate Judge carefully and accurately reviewed the record and thoroughly addressed Plaintiff's claims. The court concurs with the analysis and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge but finds two of Plaintiff's objections noteworthy.

First, the Report and Recommendation states that Ms. Reinertsen is neither an acceptable nor "other" medical source. Dkt. 18, at13. As the Plaintiff contends, SSR 06-03p indicates that Ms. Reinertsen, as a registered and licensed therapist, may qualify as an "other" medical source under 20 CFR §404.1513 and 20 CFR §416.913. Despite this objection, the court finds any error here to be harmless because Ms. Reinertsen overall found plaintiff to be capable of performing sedentary work as also found by the ASJ, and it remains unlikely the ALJ would credit Ms. Reinertsen's opinion, as well as the additional aspects of her opinion that were not specifically discussed by the ALJ, over those of the acceptable medical source opinions she credited. This is not improper post hoc speculation, as the Plaintiff contends (Dkt. 18, at 7), but rather harmless error analysis. Plaintiff's cited authority is not on point. *See Betts v. Colvin*, 2013 WL 3157434 (9th Cir. 2013) (involved an ALJ's failure to account for aspects of a doctor's opinion, not an "other" source's opinion).

1	Second, the Plaintiff contends that the Magistrate Judge did not address her argument that	
2	Dr. Hoskins' unexplained affirmance of a non-medical opinion is entitled to less weight than the	
3	opinions of Plaintiff's treating and examining physicians. Dkt. 18, at 8. Because Dr. Hoskins'	
4	opinion is consistent with the medical record and claimant's testimony, the court finds this to be	
5	a minor omission in the context of the Magistrate Judge's analysis that does not ultimately affect	
6	the case's outcome. Plaintiff's cited authority is not on point. See Morgan v. Colvin, 2013 WL	
7	3119825 (9th Cir. 2013) (an ALJ gave substantial weight to a non-physician's opinion after	
8	mistakenly believing the non-physician was an M.D.)	
9	Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 17) is ADOPTED . The decision of	
10	the Commissioner of Social Security to deny Plaintiff supplemental security income benefits is	
11	AFFIRMED.	
12	The Clerk is directed to send uncertified copies of this Order to all counsel of record and	
13	to any party appearing pro se at said party's last known address.	
14	Dated this 26 th day of September, 2013.	
15	PIAN	
16	Kaker Bryan	
17	ROBERT J. BRYAN United States District Judge	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		